

Separability of entangled q-bit pairs

Berthold-Georg Englert^{*†} and Nasser Metwally[‡]

^{*}*Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann-Strasse 1, 85748 Garching, Germany*

[†]*Abteilung für Quantenphysik, Universität Ulm, Albert-Einstein-Allee 1, 89081 Ulm, Germany*

[‡]*Sektion Physik, Universität München, Theresienstraße 37, 80333 München, Germany*

(18 December 1999; 25 January 2000)

Abstract

The state of an entangled q-bit pair is specified by 15 numerical parameters that are naturally regarded as the components of two 3-vectors and a 3×3 -dyadic. There are easy-to-use criteria to check whether a given pair of 3-vectors plus a dyadic specify a 2-q-bit state; and if they do, whether the state is entangled; and if it is, whether it is a separable state. Some progress has been made in the search for analytical expressions for the degree of separability. We report, in particular, the answer in the case of vanishing 3-vectors.

PACS numbers: 89.70.+c, 03.65.Bz

I. INTRODUCTION

A q-bit is, in general terms, a binary quantum alternative, for which there are many different physical realizations. Familiar examples include the binary alternatives of a Stern-Gerlach experiment (“spin up” or “spin down”); of a photon’s helicity (“left handed” or “right handed”); of two-level atoms (“in the upper state” or “in the lower one”); of Young’s double-slit set-up (“through this slit” or “through that slit”); of Mach-Zehnder interferometers (“reflected at the entry beam splitter” or “transmitted at it”); and of Ramsey interferometers (“transition in the first zone” or “in the second zone”).

The actual physical nature of the q-bits in question is irrelevant, however, for the issues dealt with in this paper. We are remarking on entangled states of two q-bits, and as far as the somewhat abstract mathematical properties are concerned, all q-bits are equal. In particular, the two q-bits in question could be of quite different kinds, one the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ degree of freedom of a silver atom, say, the other a photon’s helicity. It is even possible, and of experimental relevance [1–5], that both q-bits are carried by the same physical object: the which-way alternative of an atom (photon, neutron, ...) passing through an interferometer could represent one q-bit, for instance, while its polarization (or another internal degree of freedom) is the other.

Entangled q-bit pairs are the basic vehicle of proposed quantum communication schemes, envisioned quantum computers, and the like. Accordingly, a thorough understanding of the 2-q-bit states they can be in is highly desirable.

Whereas the possible states of a single q-bit are easily classified with the aid of a 3-vector (the Bloch vector in one physical context, the Poincaré vector in another, and analogs of both in general — we shall speak of Pauli vectors), the classification of the states of entangled q-bit pairs has not been fully achieved as yet. The obvious reason is the richness of the state space, which is parameterized by two 3-vectors, one for each q-bit, and a 3×3 -dyadic that represents expectation values of joint observables, so that 15 real numbers are necessary to specify an arbitrary 2-q-bit state. A first important division is the one into entangled states and disentangled ones; a second distinguishes entangled states that are separable from the non-separable ones (technical definitions are given in Sec. II below). The latter ones differ from each other by various properties. Among them is the *degree of separability*, which we would like to express in terms of the said 15 parameters (or rather of the 9 relevant ones among them, see Sec. III).

In the present paper, which is a progress report in spirit, we'll be content with an exposition of the formalism we employ and a concise presentation of some results of particular interest. A more technical account will be given elsewhere [6].

II. NOTATION, TERMINOLOGY, AND OTHER PREPARATORY REMARKS

Analogues of Pauli's spin operators are, as usual, used for the description of the individual q-bits: the set $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$ for the first q-bit, and τ_x, τ_y, τ_z for the second. Upon introducing corresponding sets of unit vectors — $\vec{e}_x, \vec{e}_y, \vec{e}_z$ and $\vec{n}_x, \vec{n}_y, \vec{n}_z$, respectively, each set orthonormal and right-handed — we form the vector operators

$$\vec{\sigma} = \sum_{\alpha=x,y,z} \sigma_\alpha \vec{e}_\alpha, \quad \vec{\tau} = \sum_{\beta=x,y,z} \tau_\beta \vec{n}_\beta. \quad (1)$$

We emphasize that the two three-dimensional vector spaces thus introduced are unrelated and they may have nothing to do with the physical space. Even if the q-bits should consist of the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ degrees of freedom of two electrons, say, so that an identification with the physical space would be natural, we could still define the x, y , and z directions independently for both q-bits.

Book keeping is made considerably easier if one distinguishes row vectors from column vectors, related to each other by transposition. We write

$$\sigma^\downarrow = \vec{\sigma}^T, \quad \vec{\tau} = \tau^\downarrow{}^T, \quad \text{et cetera} \quad (2)$$

with a self-explaining notation. Scalar products, such as $\langle \vec{\sigma} \rangle \cdot \sigma^\downarrow$ and $\vec{\tau} \cdot \langle \tau^\downarrow \rangle$ involve a row and a column of the same type; products of the “column times row” kind are dyadics, for which

$$\sigma^\downarrow \vec{\tau} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=x,y,z} e_\alpha^\downarrow \sigma_\alpha \tau_\beta \vec{n}_\beta \quad (3)$$

is an important example; it is a column of e -type combined with a row of n -type.

The statistical operators, the *states* for short, for the two q-bits themselves are given by

$$\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \vec{s} \cdot \sigma^\downarrow \right), \quad \rho_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \vec{\tau} \cdot t^\downarrow \right) \quad (4)$$

TABLE I. A minimal set of five 2-q-bit observables whose measurement supplies all 15 parameters that characterize the state P of Eq. (6).

The observable	
which identifies the joint eigenstates of	determines the three expectation values
σ_x and τ_x	$\langle \sigma_x \rangle, \langle \tau_x \rangle, \langle \sigma_x \tau_x \rangle$
σ_y and τ_y	$\langle \sigma_y \rangle, \langle \tau_y \rangle, \langle \sigma_y \tau_y \rangle$
σ_z and τ_z	$\langle \sigma_z \rangle, \langle \tau_z \rangle, \langle \sigma_z \tau_z \rangle$
$\sigma_x \tau_y$ and $\sigma_y \tau_z$	$\langle \sigma_x \tau_y \rangle, \langle \sigma_y \tau_z \rangle, \langle \sigma_z \tau_x \rangle$
$\sigma_y \tau_x$ and $\sigma_z \tau_y$	$\langle \sigma_y \tau_x \rangle, \langle \sigma_z \tau_y \rangle, \langle \sigma_x \tau_z \rangle$

with

$$\vec{s} = \langle \vec{\sigma} \rangle, \quad t^\downarrow = \langle \tau^\downarrow \rangle, \quad (5)$$

respectively. An arbitrary joint 2-q-bit state,

$$P = \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \vec{s} \cdot \vec{\sigma}^\downarrow + \vec{\tau} \cdot t^\downarrow + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \overleftrightarrow{C} \cdot \tau^\downarrow \right) \quad (6)$$

involves the *cross dyadic*

$$\overleftrightarrow{C} = \langle \sigma^\downarrow \vec{\tau} \rangle \quad (7)$$

in addition to the *Pauli vectors* $\vec{s}$ and $t^\downarrow$. The 15 expectation values that constitute $\vec{s}$, $t^\downarrow$, and $\overleftrightarrow{C}$ can be obtained by measuring 5 well chosen 2-q-bit observables, such as the ones specified in Table I. These 5 observables are pairwise complementary and thus represent an optimal set in the sense of Wootters and Fields [7]. Or, as Brukner and Zeilinger would put it, the left column of Table I lists “a complete set of five pairs of complementary propositions” [8].

Partial traces,

$$\rho_1 = \text{tr}_2 \{P\}, \quad \rho_2 = \text{tr}_1 \{P\} \quad (8)$$

extract ρ_1 and ρ_2 from P, of course. The difference between the product state $\rho_1 \rho_2$ and the actual one,

$$P - \rho_1 \rho_2 = \frac{1}{4} \vec{\sigma} \cdot \overleftrightarrow{E} \cdot \tau^\downarrow, \quad (9)$$

involves the *entanglement dyadic* $\overleftrightarrow{E}$, given by

$$\overleftrightarrow{E} = \overleftrightarrow{C} - s^\downarrow \vec{t} = \langle \sigma^\downarrow \vec{\tau} \rangle - \langle \sigma^\downarrow \rangle \langle \vec{\tau} \rangle. \quad (10)$$

The state P is *entangled* if $\overleftrightarrow{E} \neq 0$.

An entangled state P can be a mixture of disentangled ones,

$$P = \sum_k w_k \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \vec{s}_k \cdot \vec{\sigma}^\downarrow \right) \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \vec{\tau} \cdot t_k^\downarrow \right) \quad \text{with } w_k > 0 \text{ and } \sum_k w_k = 1, \quad (11)$$

in which case it is *separable*. The correlations associated with an entangled, but separable state are not of a quantum nature and can be understood classically.

According to the findings of Lewenstein and Sanpera [9], any 2-q-bit state P can be written as a mixture of a separable state P_{sep} and a non-separable pure state P_{pure} [$= P_{\text{pure}}^2$],

$$P = \lambda P_{\text{sep}} + (1 - \lambda) P_{\text{pure}} \quad \text{with } 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1. \quad (12)$$

As a rule, there are many different such *LS decompositions* with varying values of λ . Among them is the unique optimal decomposition, the one with the largest λ value,

$$P = \mathcal{S} P_{\text{sep}}^{(\text{opt})} + (1 - \mathcal{S}) P_{\text{pure}}^{(\text{opt})}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\mathcal{S} = \max\{\lambda\} \quad (14)$$

is the *degree of separability* possessed by P ; the value $\mathcal{S} = 0$ obtains only if P itself is a non-separable pure state. The number $\mathcal{S}$ measures to which extent the correlations associated with P are classical; in rough terms, a state P is the more useful for quantum communication purposes, the smaller its degree of separability.

Therefore, we would like to express $\mathcal{S}$ and $P_{\text{pure}}^{(\text{opt})}$ in terms of the Pauli vectors $\vec{s}$, $t^\dagger$ and the cross dyadic $\vec{C}$ that specify the state P . We are still searching for the general answer, but for a number of important special cases the problem is solved already. We report some of this partial progress below.

Whereas it is relatively easy to find LS decompositions for a given state P , it is usually rather difficult to check whether a certain decomposition is the optimal one. Here is what's involved (for $\lambda > 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{If } P = \lambda P_{\text{sep}} + (1 - \lambda) P_{\text{pure}} \text{ is the optimal decomposition, then} \\ &\quad \text{(a) the state } (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} (P_{\text{sep}} + \varepsilon P_{\text{pure}}) \\ &\quad \quad \text{is non-separable for } \varepsilon > 0; \\ &\quad \text{and (b) the state } P_{\text{sep}} + (1/\lambda - 1) (P_{\text{pure}} - P'_{\text{pure}}) \\ &\quad \quad \text{is either non-positive or non-separable} \\ &\quad \quad \text{for each } P'_{\text{pure}} \neq P_{\text{pure}}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Only P_{sep} and P_{pure} of the optimal decomposition (when $\lambda = \mathcal{S}$) meet both criteria. Unfortunately, their verification is rather complicated even in seemingly simple cases.

Since the infinitesimal neighborhood of P_{pure} is critical in (15), the actual value of $1/\lambda - 1$ is irrelevant and, as a consequence, we note an important pairing property:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{If } P_\lambda = \lambda P_{\text{sep}} + (1 - \lambda) P_{\text{pure}} \text{ is the optimal LS decomposition for} \\ &\quad \text{one value of } \lambda \text{ in the range } 0 < \lambda < 1, \text{ then it is optimal also for} \\ &\quad \text{all other } \lambda \text{ values.} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Obviously, a systematic method for identifying all P_{sep} s that pair with a given P_{pure} , or vice versa, would be quite helpful, but we are not aware of one presently.

III. INVARIANTS AND INEQUALITIES

The freedom to choose $e_x^\downarrow, e_y^\downarrow, e_z^\downarrow$ and $\vec{n}_x, \vec{n}_y, \vec{n}_z$ to our liking means that unitary transformations that affect only $\sigma^\downarrow$, or only $\vec{\tau}$, or both separately, turn a given P into a physically equivalent one. In terms of the Pauli vectors and the cross dyadic, such *local* transformations are of the form

$$s^\downarrow \rightarrow \overrightarrow{O}_{ee} \cdot s^\downarrow, \quad \vec{t} \rightarrow \vec{t} \cdot \overrightarrow{O}_{nn}, \quad \overrightarrow{C} \rightarrow \overrightarrow{O}_{ee} \cdot \overrightarrow{C} \cdot \overrightarrow{O}_{nn}, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\overrightarrow{O}_{ee} = e_1^\downarrow \vec{e}_x + e_2^\downarrow \vec{e}_y + e_3^\downarrow \vec{e}_z, \quad \overrightarrow{O}_{nn} = n_x^\downarrow \vec{n}_1 + n_y^\downarrow \vec{n}_2 + n_z^\downarrow \vec{n}_3 \quad (18)$$

are orthogonal unimodular dyadics that relate the x, y, z description to the 1, 2, 3 one. Since each of them needs 3 parameters for its specification, there must be $9 = 15 - (3 + 3)$ independent combinations of $\vec{s}, t^\downarrow$, and $\overrightarrow{C}$ that are invariant under (17). These are^(a)

$$\begin{aligned} a_1^{(2)} &= \text{Sp} \{ \overrightarrow{C}^T \cdot \overrightarrow{C} \}, & a_2^{(2)} &= \vec{s} \cdot s^\downarrow, & a_3^{(2)} &= \vec{t} \cdot t^\downarrow, \\ a_1^{(3)} &= \det \{ \overrightarrow{C} \}, & a_2^{(3)} &= \vec{s} \cdot \overrightarrow{C} \cdot t^\downarrow, \\ a_1^{(4)} &= \text{Sp} \{ (\overrightarrow{C}^T \cdot \overrightarrow{C})^2 \}, & a_2^{(4)} &= \vec{s} \cdot \overrightarrow{C}_{\text{sub}} \cdot t^\downarrow, \\ a_3^{(4)} &= \vec{s} \cdot \overrightarrow{C} \cdot \overrightarrow{C}^T \cdot s^\downarrow, & a_4^{(4)} &= \vec{t} \cdot \overrightarrow{C}^T \cdot \overrightarrow{C} \cdot t^\downarrow, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the dyadic $\overrightarrow{C}_{\text{sub}}$ consists of the subdeterminants of $\overrightarrow{C}$. All other local invariants can be expressed in terms of the nine $a_m^{(n)}$ s. Important examples are the determinant of the entanglement dyadic,

$$\det \{ \overrightarrow{E} \} = \det \{ \overrightarrow{C} \} - \vec{s} \cdot \overrightarrow{C}_{\text{sub}} \cdot t^\downarrow = a_1^{(3)} - a_2^{(4)}, \quad (20)$$

and the trace of the modulus of the cross dyadic,

$$\text{Sp} \{ |\overrightarrow{C}| \} = \text{Sp} \{ (\overrightarrow{C}^T \cdot \overrightarrow{C})^{1/2} \} = \sqrt{\zeta_1} + \sqrt{\zeta_2} + \sqrt{\zeta_3}, \quad (21)$$

where ζ_1, ζ_2 , and ζ_3 are the three roots of the cubic equation

$$\zeta^3 - a_1^{(2)} \zeta^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[(a_1^{(2)})^2 - a_1^{(4)} \right] \zeta - (a_1^{(3)})^2 = 0. \quad (22)$$

Admixing the totally chaotic state $P_{\text{chaos}} = \frac{1}{4}$ to the given P,

$$P_x = (1 - x)P_{\text{chaos}} + xP \quad \text{with } 0 \leq x \leq 1, \quad (23)$$

^(a)We write $\text{Sp} \{ \}$ for the trace of a dyadic in order to avoid confusion with quantum mechanical traces such as $C_{xy} = \langle \sigma_x \tau_y \rangle = \text{tr}_{1\&2} \{ \sigma_x \tau_y P \}$.

amounts to

$$\vec{s} \rightarrow x\vec{s}, \quad t^\downarrow \rightarrow xt^\downarrow, \quad \vec{C} \rightarrow x\vec{C}. \quad (24)$$

The resulting scaling of the local invariants is

$$a_m^{(n)} \rightarrow x^n a_m^{(n)}, \quad (25)$$

which is the reason for the grouping in (19).

In addition to the local transformations (17), there are also the *global* ones that represent arbitrary unitary transformations of the state P. Except for the eigenvalues of P, nothing is left unchanged. In view of the restriction $\text{tr}_{1\&2}\{P\} = 1$, there must be 3 global invariants. A convenient choice is

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= 2 \left(a_1^{(2)} + a_2^{(2)} + a_3^{(2)} \right), \\ A_1 &= 8 \left(a_2^{(3)} - a_1^{(3)} \right), \\ A_0 &= \left(a_1^{(2)} \right)^2 - 2a_1^{(2)} \left(a_2^{(2)} + a_3^{(2)} \right) - \left(a_2^{(2)} - a_3^{(2)} \right)^2 \\ &\quad - 2a_1^{(4)} - 8a_2^{(4)} + 4a_3^{(4)} + 4a_4^{(4)}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

which scale in accordance with $A_k \rightarrow x^{4-k} A_k$ under (24). The A_k s are significant because they are the coefficients in the quartic equation

$$\kappa^4 - A_2 \kappa^2 + A_1 \kappa - A_0 = 0 \quad (27)$$

that determines the eigenvalues of P: If κ is a solution of (27), then $(1 - \kappa)/4$ is an eigenvalue of P. The absence of the cubic term reflects the unit trace of P.

Since P is hermitian, all roots of (27) are real by construction, and $P \geq 0$ implies the inequalities

$$A_2 - A_1 + A_0 \leq 1, \quad 2A_2 - A_1 \leq 4, \quad A_2 \leq 6. \quad (28)$$

They enable one to check whether a given set of $\vec{s}, t^\downarrow, \vec{C}$ actually defines a state P.

The global reflection

$$\vec{s} \rightarrow -\vec{s}, \quad t^\downarrow \rightarrow -t^\downarrow, \quad \vec{C} \rightarrow \vec{C} \quad (29)$$

has no effect on the local invariants (19), and therefore^(b)

$$\bar{P} = \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \vec{s} \cdot \sigma^\downarrow - \vec{\tau} \cdot t^\downarrow + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{C} \cdot \vec{\tau}^\downarrow \right) \quad (30)$$

has the same eigenvalues as P and also the same degree of separability $\mathcal{S}$. Mixtures of both,

^(b)In the studies by Hill and Wootters [10,11] of what they call “entanglement of formation” the state $\bar{P}$ plays a central role; in particular the eigenvalues of $|\sqrt{\bar{P}}\sqrt{P}|$ are of interest.

$$P_y = \frac{1+y}{2}P + \frac{1-y}{2}\bar{P} = \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + y\vec{s} \cdot \sigma^\downarrow + y\vec{\tau} \cdot t^\downarrow + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \overleftrightarrow{C} \cdot \tau^\downarrow \right), \quad (31)$$

(with $-1 \leq y \leq 1$) have degrees of separability $\mathcal{S}_y$ that cannot be less than that of P and $\bar{P}$,

$$\mathcal{S}_y \geq \mathcal{S}, \quad (32)$$

which is a useful piece of information because everything is known for the $y = 0$ case, see Sec. IV B below.

The partial reflection

$$\vec{s} \rightarrow -\vec{s}, \quad t^\downarrow \rightarrow t^\downarrow, \quad \overleftrightarrow{C} \rightarrow -\overleftrightarrow{C} \quad (33)$$

is a non-unitary transformation of P , which is turned into

$$\tilde{P} = \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \vec{s} \cdot \sigma^\downarrow + \vec{\tau} \cdot t^\downarrow - \vec{\sigma} \cdot \overleftrightarrow{C} \cdot \tau^\downarrow \right). \quad (34)$$

Peres [12] observed that $\tilde{P} \geq 0$ if P is separable, and his conjecture that P is separable if $\tilde{P} \geq 0$ was proven by M., P., and R. Horodecki [13]:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{A 2-q-bit state } P \text{ is separable if its } \tilde{P} \text{ is non-negative,} \\ &\text{and only then.} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Now, since (33) affects only two of the nine local invariants (19), namely $a_1^{(3)}$ and $a_2^{(4)}$ whose sign changes, the positivity conditions (28) are immediately translated into corresponding conditions for $\tilde{P}$, and we arrive at this statement:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{If} \quad A_2 - A_1 + A_0 \leq 1 + 16 \det \left\{ \overleftrightarrow{E} \right\} \\ &\text{and} \quad 2A_2 - A_1 \leq 4 + 16 \det \left\{ \overleftrightarrow{C} \right\} \\ &\text{then } P \text{ is separable; if one of the inequalities} \\ &\text{is violated, then } P \text{ is not separable.} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

It is therefore a straightforward matter to check whether a certain P is separable ($\mathcal{S} = 1$) or not ($\mathcal{S} < 1$).

With the aid of a local transformation (17), one can bring a given P into a generic form. A standard one refers to the bases for which the cross dyadic is diagonal,

$$\overleftrightarrow{C} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta=x,y,z} e_\alpha^\downarrow C_{\alpha\beta} \vec{n}_\beta = \pm \sum_{k=1}^3 e_k^\downarrow c_k \vec{n}_k \quad \text{for} \quad \begin{cases} \det \left\{ \overleftrightarrow{C} \right\} \geq 0, \\ \det \left\{ \overleftrightarrow{C} \right\} < 0, \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

where the c_k s are the square roots of the ζ_k s in (21), ordered in accordance with

$$c_1 \geq c_2 \geq c_3 \geq 0 \quad (38)$$

by convention. Then, the moduli $|\overleftrightarrow{C}|$ and $|\overleftrightarrow{C}^T|$ of $\overleftrightarrow{C}$ and $\overleftrightarrow{C}^T$ as well as $\overleftrightarrow{C}_{\text{sub}}$ have simple appearances, too,

$$\begin{aligned} |\vec{C}| &= \sum_{k=1}^3 n_k^\downarrow c_k \vec{n}_k, & |\vec{C}^T| &= \sum_{k=1}^3 e_k^\downarrow c_k \vec{e}_k, \\ \vec{C}_{\text{sub}} &= e_1^\downarrow c_2 c_3 \vec{n}_1 + e_2^\downarrow c_3 c_1 \vec{n}_2 + e_3^\downarrow c_1 c_2 \vec{n}_3, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

so that

$$\vec{C} = \pm \vec{O}_{\text{en}} \cdot |\vec{C}| = \pm |\vec{C}^T| \cdot \vec{O}_{\text{en}}, \quad (40)$$

where

$$\vec{O}_{\text{en}} = \sum_{k=1}^3 e_k^\downarrow \vec{n}_k \quad (41)$$

is an orthogonal unimodular dyadic.

For example, a pure state P_{pure} has $A_2 - A_1 + A_0 = 1$, $2A_2 - A_1 = 4$, $A_2 = 6$ and its generic form is

$$P_{\text{pure}} = \frac{1}{4} (1 + p\sigma_1 - p\tau_1 - \sigma_1\tau_1 - q\sigma_2\tau_2 - q\sigma_3\tau_3) \quad (42)$$

with

$$\sigma_k = \vec{\sigma} \cdot e_k^\downarrow, \quad \tau_k = \vec{n}_k \cdot \tau^\downarrow \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, 3 \quad (43)$$

and $0 \leq p \leq 1$, $q \equiv \sqrt{1 - p^2}$. Thus, up to local transformations, pure states are characterized by a single parameter, namely the common length of the Pauli vectors, $p = (\vec{s} \cdot s^\downarrow)^{1/2} = (\vec{t} \cdot t^\downarrow)^{1/2}$. A pure state is separable if $p = 1$, not separable if $p < 1$. For $p = 0$, one has the so-called Bell states

$$P_{\text{Bell}} = \frac{1}{4} (1 - \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{O}_{\text{en}} \cdot \tau^\downarrow) \quad (44)$$

with $\vec{O}_{\text{en}}$ as in (41).

IV. SPECIAL CASES

A. Werner states

The so-called Werner states [14] are (pseudo-)mixtures of Bell states and the chaotic state,

$$P_W = (1 - x)P_{\text{chaos}} + xP_{\text{Bell}} = \frac{1}{4} (1 - x\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{O}_{\text{en}} \cdot \tau^\downarrow), \quad (45)$$

where $P_W \geq 0$ requires $-\frac{1}{3} \leq x \leq 1$ since the eigenvalues of P_W are $\frac{1}{4}(1 + 3x)$ and $\frac{1}{4}(1 - x)$, the latter being three-fold. Here one has

$$\vec{s} = 0, \quad t^\downarrow = 0, \quad \vec{C} = -x\vec{O}_{\text{en}} \quad (46)$$

and finds^(c)

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } -\frac{1}{3} \leq x \leq \frac{1}{3}, \\ \frac{3}{2}(1-x) & \text{if } \frac{1}{3} < x \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

for the degree of separability. The pure state of the optimal LS decomposition is the Bell state that appears in (45).

B. Generalized Werner states of the first kind

States P for which

$$\vec{s} = 0, \quad t^\downarrow = 0, \quad \vec{C} = \pm \vec{O}_{\text{en}} \cdot |\vec{C}| \quad \text{arbitrary} \quad (48)$$

represent a first generalization of the Werner states (45). The $y = 0$ states of (31) are among them.

The eigenvalues of $\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{O}_{\text{en}} \cdot |\vec{C}| \cdot \tau^\downarrow$ are $c_1 + c_2 - c_3$, $c_1 - c_2 + c_3$, $-c_1 + c_2 + c_3$, and $-c_1 - c_2 - c_3$ with the c_k s as in (37), and the positivity of

$$P_{\text{W,1st}} = \frac{1}{4} \left(1 \pm \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{O}_{\text{en}} \cdot |\vec{C}| \cdot \tau^\downarrow \right) \quad (49)$$

then requires that the triplet (c_1, c_2, c_3) — which is not a 3-vector — is inside the tetrahedron that R. and M. Horodecki speak of in Ref. [15].

The degree of separability of a state $P_{\text{W,1st}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \det \{ \vec{C} \} \geq 0 \text{ or } \text{Sp} \{ |\vec{C}| \} \leq 1, \\ \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \text{Sp} \{ |\vec{C}| \} & \text{if } \det \{ \vec{C} \} < 0 \text{ and } \text{Sp} \{ |\vec{C}| \} > 1, \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

and the pure state of the optimal LS decomposition is the Bell state (44) with $\vec{O}_{\text{en}}$ from (48).

C. Generalized Werner states of the second kind

A second generalization of the Werner states is obtained by replacing the Bell state in (45) by an arbitrary pure state with $0 < p, q < 1$ in (42). Then one has

$$P_{\text{W,2nd}} = \frac{1+3x}{4} P_{\text{pure}} + \frac{1-x}{4} (1 - P_{\text{pure}}). \quad (51)$$

Upon denoting by q_0 the q parameter of the pure state in the optimal LS decomposition, one gets

^(c)The numerical findings of Lewenstein and Sanpera [9] agree well with this analytical result.

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } -\frac{1}{3} \leq x \leq (1+2q)^{-1}, \\ 1 - \frac{(1+2q)x-1}{2q_0} & \text{if } (1+2q)^{-1} < x \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

and $q_0 = \sqrt{1-p_0^2}$ is the largest value that obeys

$$\frac{1+x-2xpp_0}{q_0} \leq \left(qx - \frac{1-x}{2}\right) + \left(qx - \frac{1-x}{2}\right)^{-1} (x-x^2p^2). \quad (53)$$

This gives $q_0 > q$ for $x < 1$ and $q_0 \rightarrow q$ in the limit $x \rightarrow 1$; the extreme value $q_0 = 1$ is reached if x is in the range

$$\frac{1}{1+2q} < x \leq \frac{3/4}{q - 1/4 + \sqrt{(1-q)(1+q/2)}}, \quad (54)$$

and then a Bell state shows up in the optimal LS decomposition.

D. States of rank 2

A state P, for which $A_2 - A_1 + A_0 = 1$ and $2A_2 - A_1 = 4$, has eigenvalues 0 (two-fold), $(1+x)/2$, and $(1-x)/2$ with $x^2 = (A_2 - 2)/4 \leq 1$. For $x^2 < 1$, such a P is of rank 2. Its generic form is

$$P_{\text{rk2}} = \frac{1}{2} (\Sigma_0 + x_1 \Sigma_1 + x_2 \Sigma_2 + x_3 \Sigma_3) \quad \text{with } x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 = x^2, \quad (55)$$

where

$$\Sigma_0 = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \sigma_3 \cos \gamma_1 \cos \gamma_2 + \tau_3 \sin \gamma_1 \sin \gamma_2 + \sigma_1 \tau_1 \sin \gamma_1 \cos \gamma_2 + \sigma_2 \tau_2 \cos \gamma_1 \sin \gamma_2) \quad (56)$$

projects onto the two-dimensional subspace in question. By convention, the parameters γ_1 and γ_2 are such that $\pi/2 \geq \gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq 0$. They also appear in the expressions for $\Sigma_{1,2,3}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1 &= \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_1 \sin \gamma_1 + \tau_1 \cos \gamma_2 + \sigma_1 \tau_3 \sin \gamma_2 + \sigma_3 \tau_1 \cos \gamma_1), \\ \Sigma_2 &= \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_2 \sin \gamma_2 + \tau_2 \cos \gamma_1 + \sigma_2 \tau_3 \sin \gamma_1 + \sigma_3 \tau_2 \cos \gamma_2), \\ \Sigma_3 &= \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_3 \sin \gamma_1 \sin \gamma_2 + \tau_3 \cos \gamma_1 \cos \gamma_2 \\ &\quad - \sigma_1 \tau_1 \cos \gamma_1 \sin \gamma_2 - \sigma_2 \tau_2 \sin \gamma_1 \cos \gamma_2 + \sigma_3 \tau_3), \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

which are analogs of Pauli's spin operators for the subspace defined by Σ_0 . Their basic algebraic properties are

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_0 \Sigma_k &= \Sigma_k \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, 2, 3, \\ \Sigma_j \Sigma_k &= \delta_{jk} \Sigma_0 + i \sum_{l=1}^3 \epsilon_{jkl} \Sigma_l \quad \text{for } j, k = 1, 2, 3. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

The pure rank-2 states (55) have $x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 = 1$. If $\sin \gamma_1 \cos \gamma_2 = 0$, which is to say that $\pi/2 = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ or $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0$, then all the states (55) are separable; otherwise the separable ones have $x_2 = 0$, $x_3 = \tan \gamma_2 / \tan \gamma_1 \equiv \cos(2\vartheta)$ and $|x_1| \leq \sin(2\vartheta)$ with $0 \leq \vartheta \leq \pi/4$. For $\gamma_1 > \gamma_2$ there are two separable pure states, for $\pi/2 > \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 > 0$ (and thus $\vartheta = 0$) there is only one. Equivalent observations about rank-2 states have been made by Sanpera, Tarrach, and Vidal [16].

For $\sin \gamma_1 \cos \gamma_2 > 0$, the pairing of (15) and (16) leads to pairs of three different kinds, viz.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{(a) } P_{\text{pure}} \text{ with } x_1 = 0 \text{ \& } P_{\text{sep}} \text{ with } |x_1| < \sin(2\vartheta), \\ & \text{(b) } P_{\text{pure}} \text{ with } x_1 \geq 0 \text{ \& } P_{\text{sep}} \text{ with } x_1 = \sin(2\vartheta), \\ & \text{(c) } P_{\text{pure}} \text{ with } x_1 \leq 0 \text{ \& } P_{\text{sep}} \text{ with } x_1 = -\sin(2\vartheta). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

For a given rank-2 state (55) this means the following. If the inequality

$$[(1 + x_3) \sin \vartheta - |x_1| \cos \vartheta] [(1 - x_3) \cos \vartheta - |x_1| \sin \vartheta] \leq x_2^2 \sin \vartheta \cos \vartheta \quad (60)$$

holds, then

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{(1 - x^2)/2}{1 - x_3 \cos(2\vartheta) - |x_1| \sin(2\vartheta)} \quad (61)$$

and the pairs (59)(b) or (59)(c) apply for $x_1 > 0$ and $x_1 < 0$, respectively. If (60) is violated, then the optimal LS decomposition involves pair (59)(a) and

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{\sin^2(2\vartheta)} \left(1 - x_3 \cos(2\vartheta) - \sqrt{[x_3 - \cos(2\vartheta)]^2 + [x_2 \sin(2\vartheta)]^2} \right) \quad (62)$$

is the degree of separability.

V. OUTLOOK

Since any arbitrary 2-q-bit state P is a mixture of two rank-2 states, the complete solution of the rank-2 case can be used in an iterative manner to arrive at LS decompositions of a given P . It is hoped that the optimal decomposition can be found this way, and we shall report results in due course.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful for very helpful discussions with H.-J. Briegel and I. Cirac. BGE would like to thank H. Rauch and his collaborators at the Atominstitut in Vienna, where part of this work was done, for the hospitality they provided, and the Technical University of Vienna for financial support. BGE would also like to thank M. O. Scully and the physics faculty at Texas A&M University, where another part of this work was done, for their hospitality and financial support. NM would like to thank the Egyptian government for granting a fellowship.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Dürr, T. Nonn, and G. Rempe, *Nature (London)* **395**, 33 (1998).
- [2] S. Dürr, T. Nonn, and G. Rempe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5705 (1998).
- [3] P. G. Kwiat, P. D. D. Schwindt, and B.-G. Englert, in *Mysteries, Puzzles, and Paradoxes in Quantum Mechanics*, edited by R. Bonifacio (AIP CP461, 1999).
- [4] P. D. D. Schwindt, P. G. Kwiat, and B.-G. Englert, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 4285 (1999).
- [5] G. Badurek, R. J. Buchelt, B.-G. Englert, and H. Rauch, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A*, in print.
- [6] B.-G. Englert and N. Metwally, in preparation.
- [7] W. K. Wootters and B. D. Fields, *Ann. Phys. (NY)* **191**, 363 (1989).
- [8] Č. Brukner and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3345 (1999).
- [9] M. Lewenstein and A. Sanpera, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2261 (1998).
- [10] S. Hill and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 5022 (1997).
- [11] W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2245 (1998).
- [12] A. Peres, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1413 (1996).
- [13] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett.* **A223**, 1 (1996).
- [14] R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [15] R. Horodecki and M. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1838 (1996).
- [16] A. Sanpera, R. Tarrach, and G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 826 (1998).

This paper has been submitted to
Journal of Modern Optics
as a contribution to the
Proceedings of the Workshop on Entanglement and Decoherence,
held at Gargnano/Italy, 20-25 September 1999.